G. R. S. 58]

Previous references.

File No. 140-11

1911.

Serial Nos. 1 & 2

(Miszrai)

Later references.

242-35-1-5

38-46-1-5

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 & 2

Part B for January 1912

SUBJECT.

Grant of females from hereditary appointments, such as, archak, pancha sanar etc in the Mirasi Department

---

The Commissioner of requests the passing of an order in favour of the above with regard to the claims of Pramathamma, a widow, to the office of Sri Chamarajeswara Swami temple at Chamarajanagar, on the analogy of the order passed with regard to such cases in the Revenue Department No. 674 dated 29th January 1912 that the right of females to succeed hereditary offices is uniformly recognised and requests the Commissioner to decide the case in accordance with the existing practice and pro-

GPB—5,000—22-10-10

G.R.S. 11] 19ϕ/ .

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Muzrai)

NOTES.

File No. 140 - 11

FILE HEADING.

Preclusion of females from hereditary appointments, such as archak, paricharak, Sanbogi &c in the Muzrai Department.

From

The Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District

No. 8) Dated 4-9-11. Received 9-9-11

Diary No. 385 | Enclos. 1 file Spare Copies nil | Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Requests that a general order may be passed precluding the claims of females to hereditary appointments in the Muzrai Dept, on the analogy of the practice followed with regard to such appointments in the Rev. Dept.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

The Dy Comr has sent a file of papers regarding the claim of [redacted] a widow by name Parvathiamma to the Archakship of Sri chamarajeswara Swami temple at Chamarajnagar. It is reported that she wants

NOTES—First sheet

GPB—15,000—24-4-09.

G. R. S. 127

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 1/2 of 191

Serial No.

one Chendrasekhara Deekshit to be made the Karawarddar in place of her deceased husband, in preference to one Papa Deekshit who, in the opinion of the local Officers & the Dy Comr, ~~is~~ has superior claims & is better fitted for the post.

The Dy Comr. requests that, as in the case of hereditary appointments in the Rev. Dept, females may be precluded from such appointments by a general order to that effect. (Sec 8 of the village Offices Regulation precludes females from being appointed for such Offices.)

× flag T

May other Dy Comrs be also Consulted in this matter?

Submitted for orders.

Dy R (139) 11/9/11 — 12.9.11

But are not these superior village protectors at all. Is there any provision for fixing them a portion of the post office?

12/9/1911

A copy of the Rules under the Land Revenue Code (1911 Edition) is also herewith put up. on page 59 of this

flag Y

NOTE.—Contin. sheet

Serial No.

volume is published 'para 5 of Rule XLIII of the Land Rev Rules 1890' which was kept in force by no 264 = R 1228 10-7 1901. According to this, ~~[illegible]~~ the rights of widows are safeguarded to a some ~~good~~ extent 'Soulless widows may also be, likewise, in special cases, registered as the Huckdar, ~~[illegible]~~ a Gumasta being appointed for the discharge of the duties of the office, with a suitable allowance for the maintenance of the widow'

But the village Office Regulation (passed in 1908), seems to overrule the above, as ~~[illegible]~~ sec 2 of the Regn repeals 'all existing rules & orders relating to villages offices'. Sec 8 of the Regn lays down that 'no person shall be eligible for appointment, who is not of the male sex &c', except in the case of nirgunti, totti & talari in whose cases ~~[illegible]~~ females may be appointed, for special reasons, if they are otherwise competent and further that, subject to the above provision, the succession in the

blag T

case of a permanent vacancy, shall be regulated by the ordinary provision of the personal law applicable to the last holder &c.

~~Under~~ No rules have yet been published under Sec 22, ~~regarding the~~ of the Regn & till then the present rules ~~are~~ will be in force so far as they are consistent with this Regn.

From these it seems that the rights of widows are not protected in the case of Sanboji & patel offices

If ordered, Br I will also be consulted.

Cyd (139). 15/9/11

Submitted in accordance with the first instance.

The Sanjo Village Officers' right protects the rights of minors para 4 of Section 8 and does not recognise the rights of perhaps widows. I think, we may apply that principle to Mirasi hereditary offices as also

15.9.1911

I think the principle of exclusion is quite right. But has it been the case that we have

GPB—50,000—12 8 10

Serial No.

invariably admitted such claims hitherto? If so, my doubt is whether a rule like this should be introduced by legislation or whether a Govt order would be sufficient.

12/7/11

Manager is perhaps the most often looking into any rule or order of the kind.

7/12/11

The Murzai Memorandum (which is unfortunately now out of date) is the only guide at present available & was consulted; and there is nothing in it either for or against the recognition of such hak. But a few decided cases throw some light, however faint, on the point. Attention is invited to G.O's No. 3867 of 19.4.05 & 4766 of 27.6.05 in which the heriditary haks of Bhagamma & Kaveramma referred to in the former, and of Rangammanna referred to in the latter order, though not expressly recognised by Govt seem to have been acquiesced in.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—12 8-10

Serial No.

A case coming closer to the point in question is that decided in Govt. order No. 3704 dated the 8 march 1906 in which Yeyyamma's title & claim to the archaka post in Sri Vedanta-Chari's samadhi seems to have been positively recognized by Govt.

There have been instances in the past in which hereditary appointments have been claimed through relationships to females & granted (vide G.O. No. 3572 dated the 20th may 1904).

In view of the above cases, it is a point for consideration & orders whether the present practice of recognising the hereditary heirs of sonless widows, the work being discharged by duly accepted servants, may not be continued.

If the principle of exclusion be decided on, it will probably have to find a place in the marra regulation which is proposed to be framed in connection with Pujari rights (vide file No. 254 of 1911)

24.11.11

× H. V.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G.R.S. 50,000—12-8-10

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. of 19 11

Serial No.

Submitted in Secret Council

Though there appears to be no clear instruction on the subject it has been the practice to allow the case of Magisterial hereditary Officers principles applicable in the case of hereditary Village Officers. In this view it has been usual to recognise the claim of Sonkap widows under the Rev: Rule of 1890 which have quite recently been granted to the Village Officers' Representation.

I do not think there can be any harm in following this Village Officers' Representation till separate rules are framed for Magisterial Inams.

It is a question if a general order can be passed at this stage owing on the representation of the Dy Com^r. He may decide to retain right of appeal in his case which is pending but in appeal an order enunciating the principle above referred to may be passed.

It will perhaps not be quite right to pass a general order and provide therein for retrospective effect to it.

20.11.1911

Keep till Councillors return from Delhi

20/11/11.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50 00 1—12 8 10

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

2,55

File No 1/1 of 19

Serial No.

The right of female heirs to succeed to Pujari offices has been uniformly recognised hitherto. It is not right to extend the provisions of the Village Offices Regn without resorting to a Regulation for the purpose. The question may be separately considered. Will the Govt decide the dispute in accordance with existing practice & precedents.

9/1/12

Pur for draft

8/1/12

A draft is subd for approval or other orders orders are also solicited as to ~~whether~~ what action is to be taken on the 2nd cr's remark "The question may be separately considered". May the question be referred to Bor III for further action?

C&A (139) 11/1/12 After approval & issue, the file will be retd. for consideration of the General Qs.

8/1

11.1.12

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,00 1—12-8-10

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No 1/1 of 19 12

Serial No.

Draft as 'Prop' form
By 17/1/1912
Draft order submitted somewhat for approval
Ch Sec (109)
Hen Dy 12/1/12
(79) 13 / 12
329 15.1.1912

Draft appd.

The matter of restriction may be communicated to the Leg. Dept. for note in connection with any regulation that may be drafted about mun. matters.

16/1/12

Bill in Wrapper & Schedule
By 16/1/1912

Cyd

Retd
By
17/1/12

By 17/1/1912

NOTE—Contn sheet

GPB—50 00 1—12-8 10

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No 140 of 19 11

Serial No. 2

To The D.C. Coma Inspn Dt
No 1674 Dy 20th January 1912
States that the right of
female heirs to succeed to pujari
Offices has been uniformly recog
nised hitherto & the provisions of
the village Offices Regulation
restricting the right of Suc-
cession to male heirs cannot
be extended to pujari rights.
and Requests the D.C to decide
the dispute in accordance with
the existing practice & precedents

NOTE—Contn sheet

GPB—50,000—12 8 10

DIARY No. 385

19 11-1912
SECTION Mussrai
FILE No. 140-11
SERIAL No. 1.

190

From
M. Kanakaraja Iyer Esq., B. A.
Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To
C. S. Balasundram Iyer Esq., B. A.
Secy. to Govt. of Mysore,
Gen. & Rev. Depts.

Dated 4-9-11 Mussrai Branch

Despatched

Received

General No. 87
No.

Enclosure No. 1 file

Requests that a general order be passed directing that no person who is not of the Brahmin race be eligible for hereditary appointments in the Mussrai Department.

Submitted
8/9/11

8/9/11

GBPM—21-9-1910—1,000

No. 87
Enc. No. 1 file

OFFICE OF THE Deputy Commr.
MYSORE DISTRICT,

Dated Mysore Camp 4-9-1911 ~~191~~

FROM
Sri. Kantaraj Urs Esq., B.A
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, MYSORE DISTRICT.

To
C.S. Balasundram Iyer Esq., B.A.
SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.
Inamgrai Branch

R,

In submitting herewith the file of vernacular records ending with yadast No. 40/119 dated 3.8.1911 from the Sub divisional officer of Ranjangud Division, I have the honor to state as follows:-

2. The file relates to the hara-
-ward of the Archaki appoint-
-ment, pay Rs 6/- per mensem,
in the Sri Chamarajeswara
Swami temple at Chamaraj-
nagar. The hararwardar
was Komara Deekshit. He died
and Papa Deekshit was doing
the Archaki duties.

3 Parvathamma, widow of the
deceased hararwardar requests
-d the hararward of her
ed husband may be
made

made in the name of Chendra
- sekhara Deekshit (a distant
relation) while the Amildar and
the Sub Divisional officer re-
commend that the barawad
may be made in the name
of Papa Deekshit a near re-
lative of the deceased Kumara
Deekshit. Chendra Sekhara
Deekshit and Papa Deekshit
both agree to pay Rs 2/- per
month to Parvathamma for
her maintenance.

4. As the widow of the deceased
barawardadar, Parvatham
-ma is the hukdar to the va-
cant Archak barawad. In
the case of Shanbhogi and
other hereditary appointments
in the Revenue department
it is ruled that no person who
is not of the male sex shall
be eligible for appointment.
on the analogy of the above
practice it is desirable to pro-
-vide the claims of females
to Archakships or other hereditary
appointments in the Inam

Vide Sec 8 of
the Mines
Reg T.

Department

3)

Department - At present there appears to be no hard and fast rule in the Department regarding the bara-wards of females. I therefore submit the records for reference and request that a general order be passed directing that no person who is not of the male sex be eligible for hereditary appointments such as the Archak, Parichaarak, Cook, Shambhogi &c in the Inam Department.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient servant

S Krishnaswamy
for Deputy Commr
Bd. Dharwar District

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read:-

Letter No.87 dated the 4th September 1911 from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, forwarding the records relating to the claim of one Puttatamma to the archakatwa in the Sri Lakshmiramana Swamy temple at Chamarajanagar and requesting that a formal order may be passed precluding the claims of females to such hereditary appointments in the Mysore Department.

- - - - - - - -

Order thereon, No. 1674
Mysore F 140-11-2

Dated Bangalore, the 20th January 1912.

The right of female heirs to succeed to pujari office has been uniformly recognised hitherto and the provisions of the Village Officers Regulation, restricting the right of succession to male heirs, cannot be extended to pujari rights.

The Deputy Commissioner is requested to decide the dispute in accordance with the existing practice and precedents, rules of which are cited in the margin.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Govt. Order No.5667 dated 19-1-06
" " 4766 " 27-6-06
" " 5764 " 8-8-06
" " 5572 " 20-6-04

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

By Order,
for Mig. Secretary to Government.

To

The Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District.

P.A.
3

File No. 140 - 11

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to 385

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

( )

READ--

Letter No 8784-9-11 from the Dy Comr, Mysore Dt forwarding the records relating to the claim of one Parvatamma to the ~~ORDER THEREON No.~~ archakship in the Sri chamarajeswara swami temple at chamarajam, requesting that a general order may be passed precluding the claims of females to such

over

, *the* 19

Date of issue

Signed by

SUBJECT.

GPB—10,000—19-4-10

(b)

hereditary appointments in

the Muzrai Dept

order thereon, no 1674 Exhibit D1

Rms 140-6 2

The right of female heirs 20/1/12

to succeed to pujari offices

has been uniformly recognised

hitherto ~~It is not right to~~ and ~~extend~~ the provisions of the

village offices Regulation ~~cannot~~ restricting the

~~without resorting to a~~ right of succession to

~~regulation for the purpose~~ male heirs cannot

This matter will be separately be extended to Puja

considered. ~~The D~~ rights.

The Dy Comr is requested

to decide the dispute in

accordance with the

existing practice and

precedents, some of which

are cited in the margin.

13/1/1912

For offg Secretary

16/1/12

Th. De Cour, Mysore D

*GO No
* 3867 dt 19 4 05
4766 dt 27 6 05
3764 dt 8 3 06
3572 dt 20 8 04

13/1/12